

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
OF
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD
MAY 18, 2005**

The Greensboro Planning Board met in regular session on Wednesday, May 18, 2005 at 6:05 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were Chair Patrick Downs, Tim Bryson, Mike Fox, Stephen Marks and John Rhodes. Planning staff members present were Dick Hails, Planning Director, Alec MacIntosh, Bill Ruska, Steve Galanti, and Art Davis. Stephen Carter represented the Finance Department.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE APRIL 20, 2005 REGULAR MEETING.

The minutes were approved as written.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. RESOLUTION CLOSING OLD BATTLEGROUND ROAD FROM 40 FEET NORTH OF THE CENTERLINE OF HORSE PEN CREEK ROAD NORTHWESTWARD TO 100 FEET EAST OF THE CENTERLINE OF BATTLEGROUND AVENUE, A DISTRICT OF APPROXIMATELY 500 FEET (CONTINUED FROM APRIL MEETING).

Mr. MacIntosh reported that this petition had been withdrawn. It is anticipated that it will be resubmitted later.

B. RESOLUTION CLOSING DANIEL STREET FROM BLUFORD STREET SOUTHWARD TO ITS TERMINUS, A DISTANCE OF APPROXIMATELY 550 FEET. (CONTINUED TO JUNE)

Mr. MacIntosh reported that NC A&T State University, the petitioner, had requested a continuance in order to bring in a package of street and alley closings in this vicinity at once. The Board granted a continuance until its June regular meeting.

C. 2005-2011 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM AND 2005-2006 NEIGHBORHOOD SMALL PROJECTS PROGRAM (JOINT HEARING). (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. Carter said the CIP process runs parallel with the Budget process because the CIP can have a direct effect on the City's operating budget. They must make sure that the Capital Reserve Fund and Enterprise Fund have funds included and adopted in the budget. In terms of projects funded through authorized bonds, they have to make sure the funding for the debt service on those bonds was included. Funding must also be included for new operating expenses for new facilities, such as the opening of a new fire station or rec center. The 2005-2011 CIP totals \$444.2 million. The largest service areas were environmental protection, culture and recreation and transportation. The largest funding sources for the CIP were revenue bonds, unauthorized bonds and authorized bonds. He then walked the Board through some of the service areas.

Last year, the Neighborhood Congress approached City Council about finding some additional funding for the Neighborhood Small Projects Program. This year the Manager's Office was able to set aside \$200,000 for this program. This year eleven projects were reviewed, and nine were either recommended or conditionally recommended.

Mr. Davis added that the proposals on pages 19 through 33 had individual project descriptions and gave more detail on these projects.

Mr. Carter said the City would notify property owners who have property adjacent to these parks or projects and they would be seeking signatures to show that at least 51 percent of those property owners support the respective projects.

Chair Downs asked what was the substantive authority by which this policy was made. Could this policy produce a result contrary to the interests of the neighborhood? For instance, the College Hill Neighborhood Association was fully behind the park in College Hill and actually put in the request. What he heard explained was that 51 percent of adjacent property owners must support the request. What authority did the City have to implement that as a policy?

Mr. Hails said it was a discretionary program. He believed some precedent in other areas that had been applied to this.

Mr. Bryson asked that at some point, could they review some of the guidelines of the CIP funds and make recommendations to change some requirements? For instance, every year people want signage in their neighborhoods. However, because of guidelines or regulations, etc., they are inevitably denied. There have to be some guidelines that would say to these neighborhoods that this is what you need to conform to.

Mr. Hails said there were extensive guidelines on how to do a neighborhood sign, whether you do it on your own or apply for funding through this program. The most difficult things for neighborhoods were to be able to deal with right-of-way and find a piece of property and get necessary approvals.

In response to a question from Mr. Marks regarding \$17 million for automated meter reading, Mr. Carter said that was a Water Resources project to change out all the water meters throughout the city so they could receive a reading on those electronically. There should be some savings in operating costs as we no longer will need as many meter readers. He was not sure as to the financing details of how that would be repaid.

Mr. Rhodes moved recommendation to City Council of the 2005-2011 Capital Improvements Program and the 2005-2006 Neighborhood Small Projects Program. Mr. Bryson seconded the motion. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, Bryson, Fox, Marks, Rhodes. Nays: None.)

D. ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTIONS 30-4-14.1(B) AND 30-5-5, SIGN REGULATIONS, OF THE GREENSBORO DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE TO PERMIT PROJECTING SIGNS IN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS (CB) ZONING DISTRICT. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. Ruska said they had been approached by a number of downtown businesses some months back about considering the reintroduction of projecting signs permitted in the Downtown Area. These were abolished in the 1970s. In general there has been an attitude in recent years of more creativity, more vibrancy for downtowns and loosening up some of the design considerations like signage.

Mr. Ruska said this had been on Downtown Greensboro, Inc.'s (DGI) radar screen for a number of years, but they never took any formal action to request that the ordinance be amended. The International Civil Rights Museum brought this to a head, which would like to do a very tasteful

projecting sign. That caused GDI to move immediately and ask staff to look at a text amendment, now before the Board. Staff looked at several other cities that allow projecting signs and the proposal was consistent, for the most part, with what many other cities did.

Mr. Hails said any sign could not extend out more than four feet. In general, you will find the projecting signs on the busier streets.

Mr. Ruska said the sign could be on the corner of the building just as long as they adhered to the maximum projection and the height requirement, which was a maximum of 25 feet.

Mr. Hails explained the sign illumination provisions in the amendment.

Mr. Ruska said that light bulbs around the perimeter of the sign were not allowed because the ordinance specifically talks about back lit, halo lit and reverse channel lettering.

Mr. Rhodes moved to recommend the amendment, seconded by Mr. Fox. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, Bryson, Fox, Marks, Rhodes. Nays: None.)

ANNEXATION PETITIONS:

A. PROPERTY OF LOVE AND FAITH CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP AT THE SOUTHERN END OF BLACKBERRY ROAD - 28.997-ACRE SATELLITE ANNEXATION. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. MacIntosh said this property abuts a previous satellite annexation on its north side, owned by the same church. The property is in the Tier 1 Growth Area. It is now occupied only by one house. There is an 8-inch water line stubbed to Blackberry Road at its intersection with Wild Wolf Drive, about 750 feet north of this property. By approving this annexation petition, the City would not assume any obligation to extend this water line to the petitioner's property. There is one 8-inch City sewer line just north of the property's northern line and another just inside its eastern line, and there is a City lift station in its southeast corner. The church has not yet decided which church-related uses would be placed on this property. As a result, the Police Department was not able to estimate service demand from this property; however, churches generally do not create high service demands. The Fire Department points out that this annexation would reinforce the already-identified need for a new station in the Randleman Road area. The City Manager has proposed that such a station be included in a 2006 bond referendum. Provision of other City services to this annexation would involve very little additional vehicle travel beyond the previously-annexed property to the north. The Technical Review Committee (TRC) recommended the annexation.

Mr. Marks moved recommendation of this annexation petition, seconded by Mr. Rhodes. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, Bryson, Fox, Marks, Rhodes. Nays: None.)

EASEMENT RELEASES:

A. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING RELEASE OF ALL OF A 15-FOOT POWER LINE EASEMENT RUNNING THROUGH THE PROPERTY AT 1501 MAPLE STREET. (APPROVED)

B. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING RELEASE OF ALL OF A 20-FOOT SANITARY SEWER EASEMENT RUNNING THROUGH THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF PROPERTY AT 501

PISGAH CHURCH ROAD. (APPROVED)

- C. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING RELEASE OF ALL OF A 30-FOOT WATER LINE EASEMENT RUNNING THROUGH THE CARRIAGE WOODS SUBDIVISION FROM THE SOUTH RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF PEACH ORCHARD DRIVE EASTWARD TO THE EAST LINE OF THE SUBDIVISION. (APPROVED)**
- D. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING RELEASE OF ALL OF A 20-FOOT SANITARY SEWER EASEMENT RUNNING THROUGH LOTS 28, 29 AND 30 OF THE CARRIAGE WOODS SUBDIVISION, PHASE 1, SECTION 2, AT 4813 AND 4815 MYSTIC OAK DRIVE AND 3 MYSTIC LOCUST COURT. (APPROVED)**

Mr. MacIntosh said these four easement releases had been reviewed by the all the affected utility companies and agreed to by all of them.

Mr. Rhodes moved approval of the four resolutions authorizing release of these easements, seconded by Mr. Marks. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, Bryson, Fox, Marks, Rhodes. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS.

Mr. Rhodes said he commended Mr. Davis and the group that worked with him on the CIP.

Mr. Davis said Chair Downs had the original Board resolution, and that was modified from previous years to represent its compliance under the Comp. Plan. So they requested that the Board include that.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES.

Mr. Bryson moved approval of the absences of Mr. Koonce, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Pike, and Mr. Hall, seconded by Mr. Rhodes. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, Bryson, Fox, Marks, Rhodes. Nays: None.)

* * * * *

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 6:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD W. HAILS, AICP
Planning Director

RWH/ts.ps